



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/843,152	04/27/2001	Osamu Sameshima	43890-513	7309

7590 02/03/2004

MCDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY
600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096

EXAMINER

SAJOUS, WESNER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2676

9

DATE MAILED: 02/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/843,152

Applicant(s)

SAMESHIMA ET AL.

Examiner

Wesner Sajous

Art Unit

2676

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2676

DETAILED ACTION

Remark

This communication is responsive to the amendment and response filed on 12/22/2003. Claims 1-12 are presented for examination, of which claims 9-12 are newly added.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-9 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Panasik (US Pat. 6219553) in view of Remschel (US Pat. 6141528).

Considering claim 1, Panasik discloses most claimed features of the invention as set forth in the previous office action, paper # 7, but he fails to specifically teach a display unit (e.g., the teacher's display) that displays screens of some of the plural personal computers (e.g., the students' displays).

Remschel, in a similar art, teaches a display unit (e.g., the teacher's computer) that displays screens of some of the plural personal computers (e.g., video1 and video2 related to some of the students' computers. See fig. 23, and col. 16, lines 5-11).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the invention was made to modify the wireless communication and students/teacher interaction disclosed in Panasik to include teacher/students interaction as taught in Remschel, in order to allow the teacher to monitor video information that is being seeing by the students. See Remschel's col. 15, lines 15-21, and col. 16, lines 9-11.

Re claim 2, Remschel teaches the screens (e.g., video1 and video2) of some of the plural personal computers (e.g., the student's computers) are displayed simultaneously by dividing the display unit. See fig. 4 or 23, and claim 1 above for reason of obviousness.

Re claim 3, it is noted that since the teacher's computer in Remschel is able to switch over to view of the computer display of a selected student or the teacher's computer may selectively control some student's computers (see col. 15, lines 15-21, and col. 16, lines 9-11), a specific code or indication must be provided by the teacher in order for his computer to recognize and display the desired information (i.e., video1 and video2 of selected student stations). Hence, Remschel's teaches the features of claim 3. See claim 1 for reason of obviousness.

As per claim 4, Panasik discloses the wireless display (14) has an input function (i.e., a keyboard, not shown), the plurality of personal computers are operated through

wireless communication by using the input function of the wireless display (see col. 3, lines 41-50). See also col. 4, lines 26-40.

Re claim 5, Panasik discloses that the student calculators 18, which are wireless, are capable to communicate between themselves (see col. 3, lines 44-50), which corresponds to the claimed limitations including some of the plural PCs are operated by displaying screens of some the plural PCs.

Panasik fails to teach the simultaneous display. But, Remschel shows the simultaneous display of data of selected student stations. See fig. 4 or 23, and col. 15, lines 15-21. Thus, the features of claim 5 are obvious over the combined teaching of Panasik and Remschel. See claim 1 for reason of obviousness.

Re claim 6, Panasik discloses the wireless display 14 includes a touch panel that has the input function. The Applicant should duly note that since the system of Panasik can be used with a network of electronic devices including PDAs (see col. 3, lines 41-45), it therefore incorporates a touch panel that has an input function, for such is an industry standard. Thus, item 14 in Panasik has a touch panel that has an input function.

Re claim 7, the claimed "common operation screen... in the plural personal computers" is obviously met over the teaching of Panasik at col. 3, lines 60-62 because in order for the teacher, which corresponds to the wireless display, to evaluate the student responses as class is conducted, the operation performed by the students must be done and displayed simultaneously on the teacher's display.

Art Unit: 2676

Re claim 8, it is noted that because the system of Panasik can be used with a network of electronic devices including PDAs (see col. 3, lines 41-45), it therefore incorporates a touch panel that has an input function, which may be used by the teacher select, touch or specify a desired student computer for display in the teacher's computer.

Re claims 9-10, Renschel teaches that the teacher's display or the main window is configured to output an indicator, including changing the color of the corresponding screen of the display unit, in response to an occurrence at a personal computer (i.e., an occurrence of a selected student's computer). See col. 8, line 53 to col. 9, line 2. See claim 1 for reason of obviousness.

Re claim 11, the claimed "occurrence includes a specified key being entered..." is obvious over both Panasik and Renschel because the user of both systems must enter a key in order to make the desired selection for display in the teacher computer.

Re claim 12, the claimed "display includes a processing unit for converting data received from a personal computer into information identifying the personal computer" is obvious over the teaching of either Panasik and Renschel because it is industry standard for personal computers to include processing unit to convert and process information for display, either locally or remotely.

Conclusion

3. The prior art made of record and pertinent to this application are as recited in the PTO-892 form.

Art Unit: 2676

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Box

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, DC 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306, (for formal communications; please mark "EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE")

Or:

(703) 308-5359 for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED"

or DRAFT")

Hand-held delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,

Arlington, VA, 6th floor (receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wesner Sajous whose telephone number is (703) 308-5857. The examiner can also be reached on Mondays thru Thursdays and on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's Supervisor, Matthew Bella, can be reached at (703) 308-6829. The fax phone number for this group is (703) 308-6606.

Wesner Sajous -WS-



January 27, 2004